

suggested by the Examiner, the result would not be the claimed invention.

The WebCAM+ reference describes the development of a camera system that allows users to obtain images via the internet. The WebCAM+ reference does not disclose or suggest the requirement of the present invention, for example, as recited by Claim 1, a determination step of determining whether or not said object site has image input means for inputting image based on given control information. Nor does the supplementary reference, "Developing CGI Applications with Perl," describe this requirement.

Therefore, claim 1, as well as independent claim 11 that is similar to claim 1 and claims 2-10, 12-20, which depend therefrom, are not obvious in light of the cited references. In view of the remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art relied upon in the Office Action fails to teach or suggest the present invention and these claims are in the condition for allowance.

Furthermore, the WebCAM+ and the "Developing CGI Applications with Perl" references do not disclose or suggest the requirement of the present invention, for example, as recited by Claim 21, of a browser where control information for an image input means of an object site is stored, and a network address of said site in memory.

Therefore, claim 21 and claims 22 which depend therefrom, are not obvious in light of the cited references. In view of the

remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art relied upon in the Office Action fails to teach or suggest the present invention and these claims are in the condition for allowance.

Furthermore, the WebCAM+ and the "Developing CGI Applications with Perl" references do not disclose or suggest the requirement of the present invention, for example, as recited by Claim 30, of a transfer step of transferring the result of processing at said processing step to said client, wherein said transfer step includes a step of transferring the result of processing with information indicative of a service allowable range of said server.

Therefore, claim 30, as well as independent claims 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35, which are similar to claim 30 and claims 36-40 which depend therefrom, are not obvious in light of the cited references. In view of the remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art relied upon in the Office Action fails to teach or suggest the present invention and these claims are in the condition for allowance.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Serial No.: 08/904,860
September 30, 1999
Amendment

1232-4367

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submits that in view of the above Amendment and remarks, the application is in the condition for allowance and that action is earnestly solicited.

AUTHORIZATIONS

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 and 1.17 which may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-4367.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: September 30, 1999

By: Alicia A. Meros

Alicia A. Meros
Registration No. P44,937
(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

345 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10154
(212) 758-4800
(212) 751-6849 Facsimile